India

FOR THE

No. 149. New Series.] No. 243. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1900. [Registered as a Newspaper. {Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 229
Why not a "Concordat"? 232
The State of Gondal 233
Our London Letter 234
Notes from Bombay 235
The Indian National Congress: Manifesto from Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. A. O. Hume and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji 236
Sir W. Wedderburn on Famine in India 238
The Famine in India:
1,077,000 on Relief 239
The Mansion House Fund 239
The *Investors' Review* Fund 239
Advertisements 240

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London Office. To this rule there will be no exception.

A convenient Order Form for the use of subscribers is printed on page 228.

NOTES AND NEWS.

ELSEWHERE will be found the full text of the important letter that Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. A. O. Hume, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji have addressed to the President of the Indian National Congress which meets next month at Lahore. We deal in a separate article with some of the main points of the letter. Here we may well give prominence to the following paragraph (14):—

As regards the work in England we have pointed out the striking success which has attended the labours of the British Committee. But the work in England is great and difficult, and the workers are few; and these are over-taxed both as to physical endurance and financial resources. That is why one of us who now address you (Sir W. Wedderburn) has been driven to retire from Parliament. For seven years he has had a double burden; direct work for India, together with the wear and tear of contested elections, care for the special interests of his constituents, and the multifarious duties of Parliamentary life. He has found it not possible to continue this double burden, and has therefore, with great reluctance, for the present retired from the House of Commons, in order to economise his resources for the direct work on behalf of India. This explanation seems necessary because it has been widely believed that he was retiring from public life, and was abandoning the advocacy of India's cause. This is not at all the case. He does not desire to lay down the Indian burden. He only asks friends in India so to lighten it that it may not be beyond his strength. If the personal and financial strain is removed he may again seek to obtain a seat in the House of Commons, as it is there alone that the great questions on which the fate of India depends are ultimately decided.

Comment upon this statement would be superfluous. But we commend it to the careful consideration of supporters of the Congress throughout India.

The official telegrams about the famine show, on the whole, steady progress towards recovery. The Viceroy reports that "rain is much wanted in parts of Bombay Presidency, Baroda, and the Nizam's dominions, winter crops sowings being impeded." The Governor of Bombay, however, seems to regard his Presidency with more apprehension, for he says that "rain is much needed in all districts." The famine conditions generally are stated to be passing away. The number of persons in receipt of relief has fallen to close upon a million—1,077,000—the main portion of the total being about equally divided between Bombay and the Central Provinces. In the week ending October 27, the cholera cases in the famine-stricken districts were only 106, of which 60 were fatal; and the deaths among those on relief works and on gratuitous relief were 909, or 2·2 per thousand.

A correspondent of the *Times of India*, signing himself "X.," professes to approve highly of the choice of Mr. Maconochie to preside over the Gujerat Revenue Enquiry. But he makes a most important suggestion. He points out that the Enquiry consists of three parts: (1) To go through a large number of Indian documents and accounts; (2) to weigh the evidence and the arguments advanced by the lawyers appearing for those interested; and (3) to determine how far the acts proved are in accordance with or in contravention of the practice, rules and policy of the Revenue Department. For the last, "X." considers Mr. Maconochie well-fitted; but he insists that for the first, there should be associated with him some one "of position and standing, versed in Native accounts;" while for the second it is necessary to have a man of "judicial training and experience," not below the rank of a District Judge. The writer of the letter believes that a tribunal so constituted would deal with the subject in a satisfactory way.

In the course of a series of articles on irrigation, the *Friend of India* endorses the views put forward by Mr. B. K. Bose. One of these is that, in accordance with the views of the Famine Commissioners, an irrigation scheme should not be considered only from the financial point of view, and the net return to the Government on the capital invested: account should be taken also of the saving of human life in years of drought. Another is that the Government is inclined to make too much of canal irrigation to the exclusion of the storage of water. The *Friend of India* holds that there are three dangers in canal irrigation:—(1) That in the absence of sufficient drainage, the soil may become water-logged; (2) that if the ground is not well-manured, it may become impoverished, through the salts being carried away by the water; and (3) that deleterious saline matters may be brought in the water which thus poisons the soil.

The *Friend of India* also quotes with approval from Lieutenant-Colonel Corbett, an agriculturist of great experience, on the kindred subject of the change for the worse in the climate of India. This he attributes to two causes: the destruction of forest lands and the action of surface drainage. The first was begun by the Mahrattas and the Sikhs. The *Friend of India* says:—

Since the country has passed into our possession, though not carried on with the blind folly of savages, the process of denudation has not been stayed. Probably, the work having been done more systematically, and with an object, has also been done more effectually.

Nor have the railways failed to contribute to this, trees having been "cut down by the hundred thousand to supply fuel to the engines."

Lord Curzon on tour has reverted to the theme of the duties and responsibilities of native rulers. Speaking at the Rajkumar College, Rajkot, on Nov. 5, he said:—

Young chiefs were wanted to learn the English language and to become familiar with English customs, literature, and science, and standards of truth and honesty. Those who became chiefs could not succeed by adopting English models alone, but by the adapting of Eastern prescriptions to a Western standard. The chiefs were not a privileged body. The State was not their property, and its revenues were not their privy purse, but they were intended to work, to exist, for the benefit of their people, and to be leaders and examples.

And next day (Nov. 6) at a grand Durbar, "to which all Kathiawar flocked":—

The Native States should find in their security a stimulus to energy and to well-doing. . . . They must keep pace with the age; they cannot dawdle behind and act as a drag upon inevitable progress. They are links in the chain of Imperial administration. It would never do for the British links to be strong and the Native links weak, or *vice versa*. . . . I therefore think, and lose no opportunity of impressing upon the Indian chiefs, that a very clear and positive duty devolves upon them. It is not limited to the perpetuation of their dynasties or the maintenance of their Raj. They must not rest content with keeping things going in their time. Their duty is one not of passive acceptance of an established place in the Imperial

system, but of active and vigorous co-operation in the discharge of its onerous responsibilities.

One would be glad to see some considerable reflection of Lord Curzon's energy in the administration of the Native States. In another column we have something to say about Gondal, and the Thakore Sahib of Gondal has justly spoken of his neighbour, the Gaekwar of Baroda, as "the most progressive Prince in the Province." Lord Curzon himself said (Nov. 6):—"In Kathiawar it is gratifying to me to think that those propositions, which I regard as fundamental principles of Indian statecraft, are generally accepted, and that the majority of the chiefs and Thakores whom I am addressing are already engaged in putting them into operation." Outside Kathiawar there are remarkable examples of excellent native administration: for instance, Mysore. We can imagine that the progressive chiefs of Kathiawar heard his lordship's cautions with general approval, and with mental disapproval of particular neighbours of their own in the minority indicated by him. But still there might remain a certain bitter sense of sympathy with certain other neighbours whose apparent backwardness may have excuses not obvious to Lord Curzon. There is not a little danger in these denunciations and warnings when nobody knows who are the definite parties against whom they are directed. Could not the end in view have been attained by special dealing with each of the unsatisfactory chiefs? These comprehensive lectures recall the relation of "subordinate union," with a striking, not to say alarming, emphasis upon "subordinate." Of course, the Native States "should fortify the sympathies of the Government by deserving them," but the Government is much misrepresented if it has always expressed its sympathies in times and ways favourable to the smooth working of the delicate relations. Perhaps Lord Curzon will now speak his mind with like freedom to all British officers that are in a position to influence the action of Native Princes, whether as residents, agents, or otherwise.

We note with special satisfaction that Lord Curzon made emphatic acknowledgment of the loyalty of the Indian Princes and people. He said (Nov. 6):—

There has never been a year in Indian history when the loyalty of the Indian Princes and people has been more triumphantly vindicated. Aroused by the stirring events that were passing in foreign lands and thrilled by the sense of partnership in the British Empire, they have freely offered their troops, their resources, and their own swords for the service of the Queen both in Africa and in Asia.

The Viceroy apparently limits his words to the Native Princes and peoples, but it may be doubted whether he would have any hesitation in extending them in spirit to the population of British India. His favourable attitude towards the Indians—an attitude pre-eminently marked by a determined intention to see justice done them, witness the Rangoon case—has not escaped comment in the Anglo-Indian Press; and the general result has been—we expressly refrain from going into details—that a notable change for the better has come over the tone of certain Anglo-Indian journals that need not now be named. We make no quarrel with Lord Curzon for opening out in China an outlet to the martial fervour and loyalty of the Imperial Service troops; on the contrary, it was a stroke of judicious consolidation. His remark, however, that "opportunities that we can furnish for their employment in India, or upon Indian frontiers, are few and far between," must have reference to the pacific future he contemplates in those regions, and not to the past. For what of 1897-98, with its Malakand-Bonair, Tochi Valley, Mohmund, and Tirah campaigns—four "opportunities" in a ghastly row?

The tendency which is so marked in British India to fix the blame of any official laxity on the authorities of some Native States wherever contiguity renders this possible, and the inclination to praise our own rule by laying bare the faults of Indian rulers, is a sufficient excuse for again recurring to the evidence which shows how successfully many of the Native States have combated famine and plague. To-day we deal with the Administration Report of Cutch, which in the words of the great Anglo-Indian organ, the *Times of India*, "is a record of energetic and practical measures for facing the double calamity." Regarding the famine our contemporary says:—

The Durbar were prompt in recognizing the necessities of the situation. Relief works were quickly opened; the people were assisted in growing fodder and grain by well irrigation, and the State share of the produce—for the revenue is still paid in kind—was remitted, largely in the case of grain, and wholly in the case of fodder and grass.

Further it appears that "the people employed on relief works were generally in good condition, and that no sign of starvation was to be seen in any case." And all this in one of the despised Native States.

And if we pass from the famine area, where great calamities may have called out capacities in the rulers that were previously hid—if we fix our eyes on the happy state of Travancore, which knows not famine, we still meet with the same praise of Native administration—this time from the Madras Government. Its general order on the review of the British Resident, as quoted in the *Madras Mail*, concludes thus:—

The Governor in Council heartily endorses the view of the Resident as to the high standard of administration which has been reached in the State of Travancore, and congratulates H.H. the Mahárájá on the fact.

The *Madras Mail* continues, indeed, to object to the system of State hoards and of constructing productive works out of current revenue. The system may or may not be a good one; but the possibility of such things being done gives us a measure of the prosperity of Travancore compared with most other parts of India.

Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty has come under review by reason of the rumour that he might be recalled to occupy a prominent post in the Ministry. Among others, the Simla correspondent of the *Standard* examines his record and pronounces it to be successful. "It is not too much," he declares, "to say that no Viceroy within living memory has made so favourable an impression during the first two years of his reign." The writer's recollection of Lord Ripon does not seem to be vivid, but substantially his estimate may be accepted; it is supported by the warm appreciation of Lord Curzon expressed by our Bombay Correspondent. We are extremely glad that Lord Curzon has won golden opinions from all sorts of people—excepting, perhaps, certain Anglo-Indians who arrogate to themselves and their kind a monopoly of Imperialism. How has this come about? "Since he came to India," says the correspondent, "Lord Curzon has had the game very much in his own hands." We should express the fact somewhat differently. We should say that he took the game into his own hands; or, as we anticipated from the first, that Lord Curzon took care not to be ruled by his subordinates. The fact is that what is pre-eminently needed for the post is a strong man, and Lord Curzon has proved himself a strong man—a man who would not be led by the nose by interested Anglo-Indian underlings, but would insist on forming his own judgment on the ascertained facts. And he had the notable advantage of succeeding a weak man, though that is only an accidental foil.

What, then, are the notable achievements singled out by the *Standard* correspondent as distinguishing Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty so far? First, after a visit to all the Government offices, he drew up a specific Minute reforming the traditional system of "needless voting and minuting, the enormous delays, and the utterly unbusinesslike methods which prevailed," and which had become "somewhat of a byword and a reproach" to the Indian Government. "By those who know India," says the correspondent, "this reform in the Secretariats will be recognised as alone constituting a signal monument to the Viceroy's worth." Really? Yes, indeed, in comparison with other Viceroys of the weak sort. But surely any ordinary business man would have just done this very thing in the mere course of his first day's work, and would simply have been amazed to have it accounted to him as "a signal monument" of his worth. This is not glory for Lord Curzon, but a revelation of amazing incompetence on the part of his predecessor, or predecessors.

"But," the correspondent proceeds, "Lord Curzon has done far more than this." We should hope so. Well, secondly, there is the famine. Says the correspondent:—

Many a man might well have quailed before so terrible a calamity

But Lord Curzon, from first to last, has dealt with the situation in a manner which has excited the wonder of Indian administrators and the heartfelt admiration of the Indian people.

What did he do? In autumn last year he toured, without the usual paraphernalia of Viceregal pomp, in the famine districts, "everywhere enquiring into everything, seeing personally to the pettiest details, ordering fresh measures for the salvation of the famine-stricken population, inspiring the officials with some of his own boundless energy and resource, and putting new hope into the hearts of a sore-stricken and almost demoralised population." He "kept the famine question in the immediate foreground" of State measures. He moved the Lord Mayor of London to start a relief fund, and he started one himself in India, to which he "gave from his own purse princely sums." In summer last he "left Simla for the scorching plains below," and made for far-off Gujerat, "determined to see for himself, and to reorganise, if necessary, the measures taken for the welfare of the famine-stricken population." There is only too much of this gush that would suffer badly under the most elementary criticism. The one point that stands out strong and steady is Lord Curzon's display of personal interest in the distress of the people. If that be but the least that ought to be expected from a Viceroy, yet the fact remains that by his action he not only inspired the officials, but struck the imagination of the Native population. That is a great thing, if at the same time a very simple thing. And, strangely enough, it earns for the Viceroy a notable distinction over his immediate predecessors. Anyhow, it is indefinitely gratifying that India is so well pleased with her Viceroy as to dread his transference to any other post of service.

The *Pioneer*, however much it may praise the wisdom and benevolence of the Indian Government in general terms, often finds much that is faulty when it descends to particulars. As against the malicious and over-critical persons who support the National Congress, it puts forward the claims of our Government as the best in the world; but in its turn it criticises the rulers of the country in a way that almost savours of a willingness to bring them into ridicule and contempt. Thus it begins an article on "Pedantry in the Jail" with these words:—

It is some seven years ago since the Government of India, in one of its febrile fits of "uniformity," amazed the public by bringing forward a preposterous measure for the better regulation of penal discipline.

And this eventually passed into law. Our contemporary says further on:—

That an enactment so childishly minute has not stood the test of practice hardly goes without saying. Beneath the mechanical uniformity which it has created, every sort of absurdity and anomaly has come into existence.

It is difficult to see how a Government so excellent when seen as a whole by the controversialist can become so full of flaws when the administration is considered point by point. But if we look at the matter a little closely it will appear that these flaws are not fortuitous, but the natural result of the general principles on which this most admirable system of Government is conducted. As the *Pioneer* admits, this zeal for uniformity, and this childish minuteness are not confined to the particular measure in question, which is only a flagrant instance of certain general tendencies of the Indian Government. But the following sentences taken from the same article show that this measure illustrates another great fault of that Government, its insensibility to public opinion:—

Everyone outside the Government saw at the time that it must be a failure; that it would merely deaden the sense of responsibility in Local Administrations, and cripple the energies of good Jail officers, whose efforts are the mainspring of improvement, by overwhelming them under piles of formalities.

The matter and the history of "this ridiculous code" vividly reflect some salient faults of British rule in India.

The *Tribune* returns to a point which has attracted much attention in the Indian Press. The trial and conviction of the Editor of the *Kalidas*, bad enough in themselves, have been felt as especially unjust, considering that the Anglo-Indian papers are even worse offenders. Let it be granted that the *Kalidas* used words calculated to sow animosity between different races in India. Is not the same thing done by other newspapers with a vastly greater circulation? The *Tribune* remarks:—

So far as the creation of religious bitterness among the Queen's subjects is concerned, Missionary publications have always carried the palm, and the writings of the *Kalidas* are mere flickering tapers before the blazing fulminations of Christian writers showing up the horrors of Hinduism and Islam.

But it is to be hoped that such writings belong to the past and are not to be found among the Missionary publications of the present day.

Lord Tennyson, Governor of South Australia, in a recent speech at Adelaide, promised that he and the Governors of the other Australian Colonies would use their influence to open the Indian Civil Service to Australians. This has caused some misgiving in India. The Indian Civil Service is open to all subjects of the Queen who fulfil the requirements laid down, provided that they are willing to go to London for the examination. What, then, does Lord Tennyson mean? Surely not that there is to be a simultaneous examination in England and Australia—a privilege hitherto denied even to India. This would place the Indians in a worse state than ever. Yet it is not impossible, in view of the very different positions which Australia and India occupy in the British Empire. As the *Tribune* says: "England, for the sake of her bolstered-up glory, is bound to keep the Colonies in good humour, and who but India is to be made to pay the piper?" Such an arrangement, we have said, is not impossible, but it would be shamelessly unjust. Lord Tennyson speaks of the Indian Civil Service as "the noblest career in the world." The more noble it is, the more shameful is it to make it so difficult of entry by Indians—the more cruel to make it an instrument of injustice.

The following curious case which came before the District Magistrate at Howrah on October 11, is reported in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. Sew Lall, a Marwari, accompanied his master's maid-servant to the Howrah Railway Station in order to see her off by the train. A ticket-collector, named Mawson, finding he was not himself a passenger, ordered him off the platform, and as he did not go, assaulted him. The Marwari was then handed over to the police, and a charge of trespass was entered against him, but this, it seems, was dropped on his consenting to pay five rupees. Sew Lall then charged a Sub-Inspector of Police and a constable with extorting a bribe, and the ticket-collector with assault. The Sub-Inspector was discharged, but the two others were convicted, the constable receiving a sentence of three months' imprisonment, and the ticket-collector being fined thirty rupees.

Canon Wilberforce, preaching in Westminster Abbey on Sunday last (Nov. 4), referred in broadly appreciative terms to the late Professor Max Müller and his life-work. He referred to him as "the ripe scholar, the accomplished philologist, the broad, courageous, strong thinker, the charming companion, who had just passed away at Oxford." He added:—

It is well to remember Professor Max Müller here in Westminster. He was probably the only layman who has preached within these walls. No man of this generation has ever done more than he to break down barriers, to universalise the Christ of God, to dig down to the roots of religious conceptions, to make accessible the noble truths enshrined in the sacred books of the East.

Remittances on India for 30 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.7,08,00,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3$\frac{15}{16}$d. to 1s. 4d. The following amounts were allotted, viz.:—In bills, Rs.22,12,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 3·94d., Rs.75,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3·96d., and Rs.7,13,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3·938d.; and in telegraphic transfers, one lakh on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 4d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3$\frac{15}{16}$d. will receive about 4 per cent., and above in full, and for telegraphic transfers at 1s. 4d. in full. Later the Council sold bills for Rs.39,887 on Madras at 1s. 3$\frac{31}{32}$d. Last week remittances for Rs.30,77,621 were sold for £204,383, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.7,68,27,908, producing £5,108,801. Next week 30 lakhs will again be offered.

WHY NOT A "CONCORDAT"?

THE notable Manifesto which we print elsewhere, over the signatures of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. A. O. Hume, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, marks a new stage in the history of the Indian National Congress and of India. The authors of the Manifesto were among the originators of the Congress, in whose cause, which is also the cause of India and of the British Empire, they have never ceased to labour. A critical stage—"a parting of two ways"—has been reached, at which it is fitting to review the present position and the future prospects of the Congress movement. "It will depend," as the writers of the Manifesto say, "upon the attitude and action of the Indian people and of the Indian authorities whether this constitutional movement of the educated classes shall develop into its full usefulness, by drawing together the rulers and the ruled, and promoting the welfare of both India and this country, or whether the efforts that have been made shall end in disappointment and reaction." Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Hume, and Mr. Naoroji take a hopeful view, which we believe that no competent observer of the facts will regard as unwarranted. India is now with difficulty emerging from a series of dire misfortunes, from which, however, in the midst of much tribulation, some good may accrue. On the one hand, the perilous theory that the Indian rayat is a prosperous person has been dispelled, and, with it, in a time of many difficulties and dangers, the official distrust of Indian loyalty. On the other hand, it is satisfactory to find the Secretary of State realising that the common labours of the famine have "rekindled between the Government and the governed that feeling of regard and affection which was so marked a characteristic in India." The Manifesto acknowledges the "wise and humane sentiments" that Lord George Hamilton expressed at the close of his last speech on the Indian Budget—a speech in which he frankly recognised, as Lord Curzon has done, that civil servants in India "are so overburdened with correspondence, reports and returns that they are really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day." We have passed, as Lord George Hamilton says, from the old patriarchal methods, and under the new conditions of progress and education there is of necessity a certain change in the relations of the Government and the people. The aim of the Congress is, and has always been, to secure harmony between the two by keeping the one informed of the needs and wishes of the other. Sir William Hunter described the Congress as the legitimate and inevitable result of Western education in India. Sir Richard Garth, unexceptionable Tory as he is, declares that the Congress "affords an open, honest and loyal means of making the views and wishes of the most intelligent section of the Indian people known to the Government." It is strange indeed that between the Government and the Congress there should be any hint of suspicion or antagonism. That some such feelings have in certain quarters been allowed to grow up is not to be denied. In the time of Lord Dufferin and of Lord Lansdowne the attitude of the Government towards the Congress was not what it has sometimes been in more recent years. Why should not the old relations be restored? Why should not rulers and ruled work cordially together towards their common goal? Such hearty and fruitful co-operation may well be attained "if, on the one hand, the authorities are sympathetic and forbearing; and if, on the other hand, the Congress workers do their part with zeal, tempered by sound wisdom and discretion."

The authors of the Manifesto do not ignore the difficulties of the situation. It is evident, as they say, that free discussion of grievances cannot be carried on without criticism of official acts, and it is not unnatural that such criticism should be resented. But at the same time it is the part of wise rulers to see that loyal criticism, which seeks not to carp but to provide remedies, is in the highest degree helpful. If there has been antagonism, it has been against the wish of the Congress, as its history, from its earliest beginnings, abundantly proves. Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Hume, and Mr. Naoroji do not dwell upon the points in which the official attitude towards the Congress has been open to criticism. Nor do they fail to deal frankly with criticisms which have been urged against the Congress itself. It is said to be not fully representative of the Indian people. That may be. But it is thoroughly representative of educated opinion in India, and "might become more fully representative if the local officers of Government gave the more timid and backward classes to understand that the 'Sirkar' is not averse to their participating in the movement." As for the vague allegation that the views of the Congress are extreme, no attempt has ever been made to substantiate it, and it has been denied and disproved by unprejudiced observers like Sir Richard Garth. Here the writers of the Manifesto make an excellent suggestion of a practical kind. "The Indian people," they say, "are very patient and expect but little. But would it not be a wise and kindly act of the Government of India to take into consideration each year the representations of the Congress, and give a reply, as in the case of memorials from local associations, stating generally the views of the Government on the various reforms proposed? Such treatment of the Congress proposals would give the widest satisfaction, and would at the same time draw all the best intellect and experience of the country to the consideration and solution of the difficult economic problems by which the Government of India is surrounded." It is much to be hoped that these friendly suggestions will be welcomed and adopted. What conceivable objection can be urged against them? And does not the Government of India perceive that, while it runs great risk of being misled by flatterers and toadies, who are only too often rewarded with honours and appointments, the supporters of the Congress give proof of their *bona fides* by the loss and sacrifice which they incur in the public interest? That the officials in India seek the good of the people is not denied. But will they not realise the dangers of dependence upon the reports of ill-paid subordinates, and the enormous value of frank and cordial communication with those who, having to wear the shoe, know where it pinches? "If our rulers in India," wrote Sir Richard Garth five years ago, "instead of trying to balance themselves on a dangerous pinnacle of despotic intolerance, would only descend to a safer level, and invite the confidence and co-operation of the people, I believe that they would find the task of Government far easier in India than Lord Rosebery and his colleagues find it in the United Kingdom."

Turning to the Congress workers and the Indian public, Sir William Wedderburn and his colleagues exhort them not to be weary in well doing. Their difficulties are formidable and their sacrifices heavy. But alike in India and in England there is ample proof that their disinterested efforts have brought forth good fruit. In India, as the Manifesto rightly claims, the Congress holds the field as a national representative assembly. In England the task of the British Committee is at once more arduous and more continuous. Its object is "to place the Indian view of Indian affairs before the British public, by means of Parliament, the Press, and the platform." In each of these ways a large amount of work has been done, not perhaps in a very ostentatious fashion, but with results which are "substantial and encouraging." It would be a slight exaggeration to say that what the British Committee recommends to-day the Government of India does

to-morrow. But in more than one instance—Indian frontier policy being in some ways the most remarkable—the views consistently upheld by the Congress have triumphed in the long run. It is no answer to say, as a captious critic might, that the triumph has been due rather to the force of circumstances than to the urgency of the Congress. The objection, as the Manifesto observes, would amount to no more than this—"that the Indian view has in each case been supported by the force of circumstances, and that much loss and suffering would have been avoided if that view had been accepted at an earlier stage." The Manifesto directs special attention to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, whose origin and utility—which should not be unfairly disparaged—were solely due to the Congress party, and in a peculiar degree to the indefatigable Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. In a period of political reaction few political organisations of a progressive type can claim to have accomplished so much useful work as the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. In the immediate future its work will be still more important and, we venture to predict, still more fruitful. The British public is already beginning to ask for soda-water, and though it is less practical than it thinks itself, it has had some opportunites of "realising from hard facts the disadvantage of disregarding Indian opinion." Well may the writers of the Manifesto ask why the authorities, or some of them, in India should insist upon conflict where there might well be co-operation. Happily Lord Curzon, "who by his energy, independence, and sympathy has won golden opinions from all," is at the helm. Before he started for India he declared that the qualities most needed in a Viceroy were courage and sympathy. He has proved, by many examples, that he possesses both. Is it too much to ask that he should give a crowning proof by recognising the Congress for what it is, and by accepting its aid in that first of all the Herculean tasks that confront him—the task of raising India from the slough of economic despond and leading her once more into paths of prosperity?

THE STATE OF GONDAL.

THE annual Administration Report on the Gondal State, to which we made preliminary reference last week, is, we must say, a little belated, for it is dated May 11, and it ought not to have taken nearly six months to reach London. Gondal shows such a good example in so many ways that we are encouraged to hope that such dilatoriness will be amended in future. The Indian public do not seem to be very urgent for up-to-date information, but we can give an emphatic assurance that the British public is not readily interested in any document that is six months old. If this Report were but a single accidental example we should take no notice of the fact: but it may almost, on the contrary, be taken as a typical case, and that is why we desire to use it as an example on which to base a grievous general complaint. We welcome all informatory documents; but our friends will, we hope, make a point of despatching them to us at once, and two copies at least should be sent, for two copies are ten times more convenient than one.

Gondal, small as it is among the Native States of India, has been kept in prominence by the careful, assiduous, and enlightened administration of H.H. the Thakore Sahib. Its area is but 1,024 square miles, and its population is but 161,036—the population of a moderate-sized town—and its average revenue is stated at about Rs. 15,00,000 (say £100,000) a year. The surprising thing is that such an inconsiderable State should ever be heard of in the midst of some 700 more, all overshadowed by the mighty Sirkar. It has no military department, and therefore can gain no renown in arms. The nearest approach to such a form of distinction, if it shows high spirit and a patriotic sense, yet is touched with a glint of humour. "In connexion with the South African War," runs the Report, "His Highness the Thakore Sahib offered to place at the disposal of Government all the horses belonging to his Body-guard and the Mounted Police. Happily," however, "the war took such a favourable turn that the necessity for accepting the loyal offer ceased to exist." After all, the loyal offer of the Nizam himself was not greater in proportion or intrinsically more generous. On the contrary, acceptance of the Thakore Sahib's offer would have caused a far more serious strain on the little State than has been suffered by any State whose offer has been accepted. The true glory of Gondal lies in its peaceful internal development under wise and vigilant administration. What a blessing it would be for India if every other thousand of its square miles were managed with like forethought and intimate knowledge of the conditions!

The chief disturbing element of the year was of course the famine, which invaded practically the whole area of the State. When the October rains, the last hope of the cultivators, failed, the Thakore Sahib was in England; but he at once gave orders for the starting of relief works, and in November he was among his people directing the combat against the enemy. The rainfall of the year had been little over one-sixth of the average: 5·88 inches against 30. "The Kharif crop was wholly lost, while the Rabi crop was scarcely two annas of the average annual outturn. The grass vidis almost totally failed, and the want of fodder was severely felt; it could be produced by irrigation only, and that too not sufficient even for plough cattle." His Highness has always kept his eye on the water and the wells of Gondal, and now he freely sanctioned a large expenditure for the improvement of water supply in all the towns and villages of the State, as well as advances for irrigation wells. The total advances for 1899-1900—the largest item by far being "grain for food"—amounted to Rs. 1,69,342 (a rupee per head of the population); while there remained in reserve the still larger sanction of Rs. 2,53,071. These advances are made without interest; the repayment is spread over long periods; and no doubt some considerable portion will have to be written off as irrecoverable. Besides, the Durbar remitted at once one-fourth of the Vighoti or land revenue due for the year, and suspended the recovery of two more fourths till the end of the next two years, only one-fourth being recovered "as far as possible" in the year under report. The efforts to find fodder are worth describing in full:—

To meet the scarcity of fodder, as far as possible, the Durbar Vidis (grass lands) were thrown open to grazing; but the forage was not sufficient, as the grass was of stunted growth. The use of prickly-pear as fodder was explained to cultivators, but it scarcely found favour with them; Kuria grass seed imported from Deesa was not quite successful; Lucerne grass was sown with greater success; Chhasatia (hot weather Jowar) formed the bulk of green fodder, and was extensively sown and grown, and proved to be the most valuable means of saving the lives of plough cattle.

The account of the relief-works, though brief, is full of interest. His Highness sanctioned an expenditure of Rs. 3,12,368, about one-half of which (Rs. 1,56,308) was spent in the year under report on irrigation and water-supply, on new roads and improvement of old ones, and on reclamation of land and diversion of drainage. The most important of the works—a combined irrigation and water-supply tank—is estimated to yield 4 per cent. eventually. The most marked and detailed care is shown in description of the relief camps and relief operations. "Happily no death from starvation has taken place in the whole State." The cattle perished by thousands—say 40 per cent.; and the plough cattle were only saved by the opportune liberality of the Durbar in *taccavi* advances to the cultivators.

The famine threw an unusual strain upon the police system. The following passage illustrates this fact, as well as the disorganisation induced by the onset of famine:—

Certain nomadic and pastoral tribes, such as Vaghers, Charans, Rabaris, and Bharwads inhabiting Kathiawar, began to move with their herds of cattle towards the Gir, a hilly tract in the southern part of this province, for obtaining pasture owing to the great scarcity of fodder that began to be keenly felt after the end of the rainy season. Their way lay through the Allech hills, situated in a portion of the territory of this State, and so the Police Superintendent had to make arrangements for police-patrol to watch their movements, and to prevent their cattle trespassing and committing mischief upon the lands of the poor cultivators who had raised green fodder for the support of their agricultural live-stock. At first some scuffles ensued, and breaches of the peace took place, but in consequence of the police patrolling along the line of their march safety to the crops was ensured.

Then the criminal folk within the bounds of Gondal had to be kept in order. Thus:—

Some of the criminal tribes inhabiting the Dhoraji division of this

State, such as Sindhis, Makaranis, and others, had to be looked after and closely watched by the police to prevent them from committing mischief in their neighbourhood. The Durbar had, therefore, to open relief works in the vicinity of their villages with a view to keep them engaged, and thus save the peaceful portion of the population from their depredations and lawless pursuits.

Besides, the police had to protect the "large stocks of grain and grass" which had to be imported by rail and distributed by road "along the highways and byways of the State, lest the famine-stricken people might fall upon them." Further, the police of the villages had to be strengthened in order to calm the fears of the people, who were keen "to remove to the chief towns of the State with their valuables for better security." Yet "there has not been a single case of outlawry or of serious dacoity involving great loss of life and property during the year of report within the limits of this State." During the year there have been only two dacoities—the same number as last year; and all other offences have declined, with the exception of simple thefts, thefts by housebreaking, and robbery, in which there has been a large increase—an increase, as the Report justly says, "naturally looked for in a year of acute and widespread famine."

The famine has also had a curious, but scarcely surprising, effect upon litigation. The Report states:—

The collective value of suits filed during the year under notice was Rs. 1,41,638, against Rs. 3,17,402 the preceding year, showing a great drop of Rs. 1,75,764 in the value of the suits filed. The reason of this large decline in the valuation of suits must be sought in the great diminution this year in the number of civil suits filed owing to the famine prevailing in the country. The Sar Nyayadhish reports that there is a great falling-off in the number of suits against cultivators this year, it being 181 against 799 the year before, and the result is but natural, having regard to the great distress amongst the agricultural class.

Nor is the judicial work in arrear. "There were no appeals pending disposal at the end of the last year in the Sar Nyayadhish's court;" and there were only three regular appeals pending in the Hazur court.

As we have already noted, the efficiency of the Education Department "has been satisfactorily maintained;" "fortunately the abnormal condition of the year has had little injurious influence over its general working." Even in connexion with the relief works schools for the children were improvised and kept going. The Grasia College is prospering: "The number of students on the register is sixty-one as compared with forty-three at the end of 1898." At length all the Prants of Kathiawar are represented on the books; and "that the institution is making its influence felt outside Kathiawar is shown by the fact that one of the admissions is from Dehgamda under Idar (Mahi Kantha), and another from Motiboru, Taluka Dholka (Ahmedabad District)." Still, the contributions of the Grasias only amount to two-fifths of the total expenditure by the Durbar. In an appendix is given an interesting report of the proceedings on the second Prize-day (February 1, 1899), when the distribution was made by the Thakore Sahib's enterprising neighbour, the Gaekwar of Baroda—"the most advanced and progressive Prince in the Presidency," as the Thakore Sahib observed. On that occasion His Highness explained the origin and object of the College. "The condition of our Grasias," he openly said, "is becoming worse day by day." Why? It "is chiefly attributable to their culpable indifference to education." They will not deign to attend ordinary schools, and there are no schools suitable to their rank.

With a view to supply this want, and to fit the cadets of noble though embarrassed families to hold their proper position in society, this College is founded. How far the remedy proves successful remains to be seen. Not that I hesitate to believe in the refining agency of education. This is now manifest to the meanest understanding. But the fact is, the problem of education is as difficult to solve as the problem of life itself. The solution must rest in the hands of experts who have devoted their life-time to the study of the subject. I for one believe that our schools and colleges should, as in England, be the nurseries of character, where the cultivation of manly qualities may receive as much care as the cultivation of intellect. It cannot be gainsaid that Englishmen owe their present greatness chiefly to their healthy school life. Convinced of this fact, I am trying to plan and model this college on the lines of public schools in England.

One is gratified to learn that the noble efforts of the Thakore Sahib are clearly on the straight way to success. In his own person, and in the persons of his children, he has shown his people the highest example. And Englishmen cannot but regard with sympathetic interest and respect his indefatigable and judicious endeavours to apply the best methods of the West to the furtherance of the welfare of the people committed to his charge.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

Although Lord Salisbury has ceased to be Foreign Secretary he intends to retain his rooms at the Foreign Office. He and his successor will thus continue to work under the same roof—Lord Lansdowne as Foreign Secretary and Lord Salisbury as Privy Seal and other things. The former would probably like to sing in the words of Mr. Kipling's ode—

> Daughter am I in my mother's house
> And mistress in my own,

but the difficulty will be to know whether the house is his or Lord Salisbury's. Strictly speaking, the Prime Minister is now the mother-in-law of the establishment. He has become what he has said he never would consent to be—a dowager in his own department. The arrangement, while lessening the dignity of the Prime Minister, scarcely promises to add to the authority of Lord Lansdowne. It is announced, too, that Lord Cranborne is about to be brought into the Foreign Office to complete the triangle. No great penetration is required to forecast the result. If successes are achieved at the Foreign Office the credit will be given to the Cecil combination, while on the other hand the responsible Minister will only be held answerable for the failures. Poor Lord Lansdowne!

Of all the new appointments the most remarkable is that of Mr. Brodrick to the War Office. Lord Salisbury's cynicism reaches its height in this master-stroke. His supporters had demanded a Hercules to cleanse an Augean stable, and the Prime Minister, so to speak, presents them with a Tom Thumb armed with a powder-puff. The absurdity of the appointment is emphasised by the fact that Mr. Brodrick will be Lord Roberts's chief—the chief of the most popular man in the British Empire—while he himself is absolutely unknown outside a limited official circle. One thing made manifest by Mr. Brodrick's promotion is that Lord Salisbury has no intention of revolutionising either the War Office or the British Army. The new Secretary of State is a perfect type of the placid permanent official.

Trivial as many of the changes have been, they have tended on the whole to strengthen the Tory element in the Government. Lord Selborne is spoken of in some quarters as a Liberal Unionist, and is said to have displaced a Conservative. It would be difficult to discover the difference between Lord Selborne's alleged Liberalism and Mr. Goschen's Conservatism. As a matter of fact, Mr. Goschen never called himself a Conservative. He was and is a member of the Carlton Club, but has always chosen to be described simply as a Unionist. Moreover, it can only be force of habit that prompts Lord Selborne to continue calling himself a Liberal. He is quite as great a Tory as Mr. Goschen, and, notwithstanding his training at the Colonial Office, is rather less of a Chamberlainite. In any case, he will certainly be found on the side of his father-in-law in the event of any difference of opinion between Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Salisbury. Nor has Lord Lansdowne any reason to support the schemes of the Colonial Secretary. The friends of the latter were in the forefront of those who did their utmost to make the ex-Minister for War the scapegoat of his colleagues, while, on the other hand, Lord Salisbury offered him promotion in the teeth of a universal expression of disapproval. So far as they have gone, then, the changes, with one or two slight exceptions, have indicated on Lord Salisbury's part an almost arrogant determination to be master in his own Cabinet.

Having failed to impose its views on Lord Salisbury in the reconstruction of the Government, the *Times* has now taken the Liberal party under its wing. Liberals are told that they can only hope to rise regenerated from the ashes of the past by the aid of Lord Rosebery. This is an opinion shared no doubt by some Liberals, but few indeed agree with the *Times* in thinking that the way to go about the business is to begin with a fresh disintegration. Happily, Lord Rosebery is not at all likely to take his marching orders from a Ministerial newspaper. If he ever returns to the Liberal leadership it will be in compliance with a generally expressed feeling, and not by forcing himself into rivalry with his old colleagues, or by forming a faction within the party. A correspondent calling himself "Spectator" urges that some machinery should be devised to enable Liberals to express their minds on this question. The machinery is already in existence. If Lord Rosebery were willing to return, and if his former colleagues desired to serve under his leadership, they would presumably invite him to act as leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. Lord Kimberley would probably be one of the first

to welcome the errant shepherd and to reinvest him with the crook of responsibility. But how far this arrangement would be acceptable to the main body of the Liberal party is another question.

Even the War Office has at last abandoned the pretence that the war in South Africa is over. Lord Roberts, the illness of whose daughter has evoked widespread sympathy, puts a brave face on his disappointments and suggests that but for the mendacious optimism of ex-President Steyn the Boers would have submitted to the inevitable long ago. Unfortunately, the British public has heard this explanation before. Oft-repeated predictions of a speedy collapse of the enemy's resistance fall now on incredulous ears. More attention is paid to calculations like that of Dr. Conan Doyle who estimates that with only fifteen thousand Boers left in the field and wastage by war and disease going on at the rate of about five hundred men a week, the end can only be a matter of time. Dr. Doyle knows the Boers, and accordingly he credits them with a determination to continue the fight till they are overcome by exhaustion. The process, therefore, becomes literally one of conquest by extermination.

Both at home and abroad the public are looking forward with exceptional interest to Lord Salisbury's speech at the Guildhall to-morrow night. As the Prime Minister is not a man of many words he may disappoint some sections of his world-wide audience. On the Continent people are anticipating a deliverance on China, while at home everyone is eager to hear what the Prime Minister has to say about South Africa. "We seek no territories, we seek no goldfields," said Lord Salisbury at the last Guildhall banquet. He will doubtless revert to that text to-morrow, and if so it will of course be his duty to show how without seeking we have found. The occasion, too, will be notable as the first on which Lord Salisbury has been the Lord Mayor's guest as a Minister without being at the same time Foreign Secretary. Lord Lansdowne, Lord Selborne, Mr. Brodrick, and other members of the Government will make their first public appearances on the same occasion in their new Ministerial capacities.

As an indication of the temper of the times it is worth noting that a great effort was made by the new Lord Mayor to get this year's civic show converted into a purely military pageant. Less bellicose than the Mansion House, the War Office declined to sanction the scheme, so that to-morrow the citizens of London will have nothing more exciting to look at than the usual procession of *tableaux vivants*, allegorical cars, fire brigades, policemen, and prosperous aldermen. It is to be hoped that the spectacle may have a sedative effect on the overstrung nerves of the people. Recent festivities have shown a tendency to degenerate into orgies, and, as is indicated by the appeal which Lord Roberts has felt constrained to address to his countrymen warning them against excessive hospitality to the returning troops, London has to redeem its character for sobriety. Few people remember, by the way, that when Dean Kitchin at the beginning of the year dared to say what Lord Roberts is saying ten months later he was denounced as a pro-Boer and solemnly rebuked from the bench by one of her Majesty's judges. Time, says the sage, is the ally of wisdom.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

MR. CAINE'S RE-ELECTION.

LORD CURZON'S POPULARITY.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, October 20.

India has reason to be thankful that at least one old friend of hers has been able to secure re-entry into St. Stephen's. There was the sorest need of half a dozen true and good Englishmen, of great sympathy and broad-mindedness, going into Parliament. But it seems the Fates have at this momentous juncture deprived the country of the assistance of such friends. Of course, one Indian has been re-elected; but to all intents and purposes he may call himself anything but Indian. To have leaned upon him would have been leaning upon a broken reed. Under the circumstances, it is some consolation to learn by wire that that old and tried friend of India, Mr. W. S. Caine, has been able to get back into the House of Commons where, save in the last Parliament, he was for well nigh fifteen years a most familiar figure. India remembers his many mortal combats with Secretaries of State in times past on general Indian questions and temperance questions in particular. His intimate contact with enlightened Indian citizens of all shades of opinion, his wonderful insight to comprehend at a glance their wants and wishes, their reasonable aspirations, and their long standing grievances—all these eminently fit him to take the front rank on the Liberal side of the House on all Indian questions. However deeply we lament the decision of Sir William Wedderburn not to offer himself for re-election, though with very good chances with his old and friendly constituency, it is to us a consolation that Mr. Caine will in a large measure worthily and honourably fill the place of that true and disinterested friend of India, the like of whom we may not see for many a year to come. Of course, Mr. Caine will not have the advantage of Sir William's long Indian official experience. At the same time he is a veteran in Parliamentary tactics and is combative enough to beard the roaring lions of the opposite camp in their den. He can give a bad quarter of an hour to Lord George Hamilton and hold his own against Sir Henry Fowler. Anyhow, with Mr. Caine on the same Bench with Sir Henry Fowler, it is to be hoped we may no more witness that "kowtowing" to "my Lord George" which had become a regular institution or fetish. Bombay, at least, has not allowed the grass to grow under her feet. The Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta lost no time on behalf of himself and other political friends of Mr. Caine to cordially felicitate him on his re-entry into the House of Commons.

But whilst India is congratulating herself on Mr. Caine's re-election there comes the rumour of the probable recall of Lord Curzon to take charge of the portfolio of the Foreign Office, for which he is eminently fitted. This news has had a very disquieting effect on us Indians. As yet this disquietude has not found articulate expression in the Press, as the report requires confirmation. It is devoutly to be hoped that it may never be confirmed. India, at this critical juncture, sorely needs at the helm of her affairs a Viceroy of the almost heroic type of Lord Curzon. It is no flower of rhetoric to use that expression. I use it deliberately; for I am of the conviction that no Viceroy within recent times has shown himself such an excellent hero in the field of Indian administration—a most complicated maze. He is no dumb-driven figure—not an ornamental figurehead—not a mute mandarin who nods his head by way of assent as if to imply that he says "ditto" to his so-called "responsible advisers." No. Lord Curzon is made of sterner stuff. Though only two years old in office, he has shown ample credentials of his fitness to rule for the next ten years to come. Those two years have been years of exceptional brilliancy. He is no mere coruscation on the Indian planetary horizon. Rather he shines like a fixed star. His frontier policy has met with general approval, because, whatever his previous opinions may have been, only a short time was needed to tell us that he saw through the tangled morass of border difficulties, and promptly came to the conclusion that after all the old policy of John Lawrence, partly modified to the circumstances of the day, was the best. And he had the courage to carry it out fearlessly. As a result we have tranquillity on the borders. The tribes are friendly and are understanding the new policy. This is a distinct gain. Moreover, Lord Curzon, by singular good fortune, has also been able to make himself popular with the Princes and Feudatories of the Empire, some of whom he has visited and many more of whom he is shortly going to visit. They say one touch of nature makes the whole world kin. It may be truly said that one touch of the Curzonion stroke of policy has made the entire world of Indian Feudatories aglow with warm personal affection for this exalted representative of her Majesty. Here he has charmed them much after the manner of the ever-to-be-lamented Lord Mayo.

But apart from these things the courage and sympathy he has displayed in all our administrative affairs extort our admiration. We have nothing but unqualified approbation for his stern sense of duty and righteousness. It is this sense which has been able to rehabilitate British justice on her high altar, whence it had been dethroned by the narrow-minded, prejudiced, and even short-sighted white Brahmins of the official hierarchy. His solicitude to respect reasonable Indian opinion and Indian religious and social sentiments has endeared him to all classes of the population, while his determination and unabating energy to alleviate the hard lot of the millions of the famine-afflicted are the theme of universal praise. Only this morning we get a long telegraphic summary of what his Government has been able to do in the matter of preventing the horrors of famine. He shrinks not from recognising what onerous responsibilities an enlightened and humane Government like that of British India has to discharge in a year of universal distress like the one through which we have recently passed; and he tells us *coram populo* how willing is his Government to profit by the lessons which the direst famine of the century has taught. In reality, Lord Curzon has found as yet little time to attend to domestic reforms. India has been wistfully looking for them and has hopes that if his lordship's services are spared for the remaining three years, much might be accomplished. At such a time his recall would be a serious misfortune. It would be a political calamity of the first magnitude as famine is a physical one. And the Queen of England and her great Prime Minister should think twice before recalling a Viceroy who is yet at the threshold of his career. His recall might be a gain to England but it would be a loss to India. This is the aspect which should be well borne in mind by the British Government. We cannot afford to lose Lord Curzon at this juncture, when he is just entering on the path of those great domestic reforms which have waited for many a year—reforms among which pre-eminently stands the amelioration of the condition of the indigent peasantry of the country.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

MANIFESTO FROM SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, MR. A. O. HUME, AND MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

A REVIEW OF FIFTEEN YEARS' CONGRESS WORK.

CALL TO THE YOUNGER GENERATION.

The following Manifesto, addressed to the President of the forthcoming Congress at Lahore, has been issued by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. A. O. Hume, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Copies have been circulated to the Secretaries of Congress Committees in India, and the authentic copy, signed by the authors, will be forwarded in due course to the President of the Lahore Congress.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, at Lahore.

Dear Sir,—We think it desirable at the present time briefly to review the position of the Congress Movement, and its future prospects. This seems necessary because we, who were among its originators, have now well-nigh completed our work as pioneers; we have given the lead to the younger men, and must look to them to take up in larger measure the burden of the work. Also the present is a critical time for the movement: a parting of two ways; as it will depend upon the attitude and action of the Indian people, and of the Indian authorities, whether this constitutional movement of the educated classes shall develop into its full usefulness, by drawing together the rulers and the ruled, and promoting the welfare of both India and this country; or whether the efforts that have been made shall end in disappointment and reaction. Our belief is that there is ground for hope; for signs are not wanting that the dire misfortunes which have overtaken India in the last few years have had the effect of dispelling some dangerous fallacies, and of uniting all classes in their efforts to meet the common calamities.

2. From this point of view we cordially welcome the spirit of the declarations made by Lord George Hamilton at the close of his speech on the Indian Budget last July. While justly claiming credit for the perfected mechanism of the Indian official system, he admitted that that system was too centralised, and that in consequence the district officials were deprived of the power of initiative, and taken out of touch with the people: "We have," he said, "passed from the old patriarchal methods. The gentlemen who go out to India now are in a different position. Everybody has a Code for everything, and if the Code fails there is the telegraph by which we can get assistance at the earliest possible moment. But that is not the only evil from which Civil Servants in India suffer. They have everything that develops, telegraphs and railways, and the result is that they are so overburdened with correspondence, reports, and returns that they are really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day, and it is only when such a great calamity as that with which India is now afflicted occurs and sweeps away all their stereotyped procedure that these men are able to come out of their offices and join with the other forces at work in dealing with the trouble." Lord George then went on to acknowledge, regretfully, that, owing to this isolation of the European officials, our Government has not, in recent years, increased its popularity, and that our measures have not all been palatable to the people. But he believed that now good will come out of evil, seeing that the joint labour in the Famine districts has "rekindled between the Government and the governed that feeling "of regard and affection which was so marked a characteristic in India." As regards the future he expressed his hope "that the interchange of kindly feeling and mutual regard among all classes who have fought the common fight may be a lasting and increasing influence in guiding the future fortunes of India."

3. The expression of these wise and humane sentiments by the Secretary of State on so important an occasion is a subject for sincere congratulation; and will tend materially to remove some of the principal obstacles in the way of successful Congress work. The fact noted by Lord G. Hamilton must be recognised—that the old patriarchal relations, with their special bonds of union, have been in great measure dissolved. From many points of view this change is to be regretted, but we must accept it as one of the signs of progress. It has been one result of higher education. But other results of this education are manifested in increased public spirit, rectitude, and independence. And these results we desire to utilise in order to create new bonds of union adapted to the altered conditions. Much may be hoped for as regards cordial and fruitful co-operation between the rulers and the ruled if, on the one hand, the authorities are sympathetic and forbearing; and if, on the other hand, the Congress workers do their part with zeal, tempered by sound wisdom and discretion.

4. Undoubtedly there have in the past been serious misunderstandings with regard to the objects and methods of the Congress; difficulties have arisen in consequence; and with a view to smoother working in future, it seems desirable frankly to state these difficulties, and show as far as possible how they have originated, and how they may best be overcome. The Congress movement was, as pointed out by the late Sir W. W. Hunter, "the legitimate and inevitable result of Western education in India," and it represents the laudable aspirations of the educated classes to do their part in promoting the welfare of India, and especially in improving the economic condition of the masses. The educated classes recognise that British rule is a necessity. They know that under existing conditions India cannot stand alone, and the only other alternatives are Russian rule, or anarchy, either of which would be destructive of their best hopes. The fundamental principle therefore of the Congress is the maintenance of British rule; the object being to make it so conformable to the welfare and wishes of the people as to give it the strength and permanence of a national government. The originators of the Congress movement designed to attain this object by placing at the disposal of the Government the most mature experience of responsible Indian public opinion; and for this purpose it was decided to hold an annual Congress, to which the members should be freely elected from all parts of India. The scheme took shape in 1885, when the first Congress met in Bombay; and since then each year a Congress has been held in some important centre, and after full debate resolutions bearing on the welfare of the people have been passed and duly transmitted to the Government. All the proceedings have been open and public, and by thus providing a constitutional channel for bringing popular grievances before the Government, the Congress seeks to remove the tendency to underground discontent and secret conspiracy which is a danger necessarily attending an administration conducted by foreigners on autocratic lines.

5. Such being the purposes and work of the Congress, we claim that the movement deserves to be welcomed and fostered by the Government, as doing good and unselfish service to the State. Unfortunately this has not always been the policy pursued; on the contrary, the official attitude towards the Congress has often been one of disapproval and suspicion. We quite realise the difficulty of the situation. It is evident that free discussion of grievances cannot be carried on without criticism of official acts, and it is not unnatural that such criticism should be resented; so that unless allowances are made by the authorities, strained relations must result. But we are confident that if a feeling of antagonism has existed it has not been sought, or desired, by the Congress. On the contrary, the desire of the Congress has always been to gain the favour of the Government, as the only way of obtaining the reforms prayed for. As all the power rests with the Government, any other policy would have been suicidal. Accordingly the first idea of the Congress leaders was to pray the Government to allow a high local official to preside over their deliberations; and, for this purpose, when the first Congress was being organised, the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, was approached, with a view to the meeting being held under the presidency of Lord Reay, then Governor of Bombay. Lord Dufferin approved the proposal as showing the desire of the Congress to work in complete harmony with the authorities; but he pointed out that many difficulties would be involved if a high official presided over such an assembly. The idea was therefore abandoned, but none the less the first Congress was opened with the friendly sympathy of the highest authorities. At the second Congress Lord Dufferin showed his sympathy by inviting the members of the Congress, as distinguished visitors to Calcutta, to a garden party at Government House. And a similar compliment was paid to them by Lord Connemara, the Governor of Madras, in the following year. But the most important incident affecting the position of the Congress took place in December, 1890, when the meeting was again held at Calcutta, during the viceroyalty of Lord Lansdowne. On that occasion some doubt

had arisen regarding the orders of the Government as to officials attending the meetings of Congress; and Lord Lansdowne, having been appealed to, gave a clear expression of his wishes on the subject. His instructions are contained in a letter addressed to the General Secretary of the Congress. After declaring that the Congress was one of those movements which the Government of India regarded as "perfectly legitimate in themselves, and which private persons are free to promote," the letter went on as follows: "The Government of India recognise that the Congress movement is regarded as representing in India what in Europe would be called the more advanced Liberal party, as distinguished from the great body of Conservative opinion which exists side by side with it. They desire themselves to maintain an attitude of neutrality in their relations with both parties, so long as these act strictly within constitutional limits. They intend that all Government servants shall preserve a similar attitude of neutrality, and shall abstain from active participation in political or quasi-political movements of all kinds; and also from putting pressure upon others in order to induce them to take part, or not to take part, in any movement which is legitimate in itself."

6. It is to be regretted that the equitable and judicious rule of neutrality laid down by Lord Lansdowne has not always since then governed the actions of all our Indian officers, and that, in not a few localities, people have come to believe that they suffer more or less for belonging to the Congress, and even come under official disfavour because they are known to be subscribers to, or constant readers of, the Journal INDIA, which seeks to set forth the Indian view of Indian affairs.

7. We need not go into any particulars on this point, as we hope and trust that by-gones will now be by-gones. But it has been necessary to refer to these strained relations in order to consider what can be done to remove any antagonism which may exist between official feeling on the one hand, and the Congress, as representing independent public sentiment, on the other.

8. Let us consider what are the shortcomings alleged against the Congress. Our opponents object that it is not fully representative of the Indian people. We are quite willing to admit this. At the same time we claim that it represents a very important body of public opinion, and especially the educated opinion. If certain classes hold themselves aloof, whether from timidity, indifference, or hostility to the movement, that is not our fault. For the Congress recognises no distinctions of class, race, or religion; and gladly welcomes all who will unite to work for the common good. Neither in India, nor elsewhere, is it practicable to obtain complete national representation, but our desire is to make our system as perfect as possible; and no doubt the Congress might become more fully representative if the local officers of Government gave the more timid and backward classes to understand that the "Sirkar" is not averse to their participating in the movement. Again, the opponents of the Congress allege that its views are extreme, and the reforms prayed for unreasonable. Such allegations are vague, and cannot, we believe, be substantiated by reference to the resolutions passed year by year in the Congress. But would it be surprising if the prayer for redress of grievances became urgent, and even vehement, when we consider the sufferings of the Indian people, and remember that they have patiently renewed their prayer from year to year since 1885? The Indian people are very patient, and expect but little. But would it not be a wise and kindly act of the Government of India to take into consideration each year the representations of the Congress, and give a reply, as in the case of memorials from local associations, stating generally the views of the Government on the various reforms proposed? Such treatment of the Congress proposals would give the widest satisfaction, and would at the same time draw all the best intellect and experience of the country to the consideration and solution of the difficult economic problems by which the Government of India is surrounded.

9. In response to Lord G. Hamilton's sympathetic expressions we offer these suggestions as to the best means of removing antagonism, and bringing British officials into friendly touch with popular sentiment in India. No one doubts the desire of these officials to exercise their authority for the ultimate good of the people, but as foreigners it is difficult for them to learn the real facts, especially those of a disagreeable kind. Being "imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day," they have little opportunity for that frequent and familiar intercourse with all classes of the population, which was the strong point of the older school of administrators. Hence the officers of Government are dependent for their information upon the reports of their subordinates, many of whom are inadequately paid, and belong to a class whose interests are not identical with those of the peasant, the trader, and the professional man. And the result is a very wide divergence of opinion between the European official and the Indian public, regarding some of the most important current events. We do not claim that the latter are always in the right. But it is a good proverb which says that no one knows where the shoe pinches but the wearer. And however skilful the maker of the shoe may be, it is important that he should know where the pinch makes itself felt, even if the remedy proposed by the wearer may not, for the moment, appear to him practicable, or even desirable.

10. So much as regards the action and attitude of the authorities towards the Congress. We will now add a few words addressed to the Congress workers and the Indian public. Let them not be weary in well doing! We know well the difficulties of their position, and the sacrifices involved. But when we consider the objects of the Congress, and the extent to which those objects have (under very arduous circumstances) been fulfilled, we feel that there are many grounds for satisfaction and encouragement. What are our objects (*a*) in India, and (*b*) in England? (*a*) Taking as our basis the maintenance of British rule, our object in India has been to obtain solidarity of public opinion, founded upon the widest experience and the wisest counsels available under existing conditions. This part of our work has been in great measure accomplished. The Congress programme, stated in the form of definite resolutions upon all the leading questions of the day, has been gradually matured during the last fifteen years, and has practically been accepted as expressing independent public opinion throughout India. No doubt much adverse criticism has been brought to bear upon Congress aims and methods, but we are not aware that any of the recorded resolutions have been shown to be erroneous in fact or, from the Indian point of view, unreasonable in purpose. Moreover those who attack the Congress cannot point to any body of organised opinion which can in way compete with that represented by the Congress; nor have they shown how the machinery or structure of the Congress might be amended, so as to make it more widely representative. We may therefore claim that the Congress holds the field as a national representative assembly, and that, as regards solidarity of public opinion, its object in India has practically been attained.

11. (*b*) As regards England a much heavier task lies before the Congress; but the work must be done, for here is the seat of power. When we consider the vast and varied home, foreign, and colonial interests of the British Empire, the difficulty of obtaining and retaining attention to Indian affairs will be realised. But much has been accomplished of a practical kind. The object of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress has been to place the Indian view of Indian affairs before the British public, by means of Parliament, the Press, and the platform; and in all these directions the results have been substantial and encouraging. In the House of Commons an Indian Parliamentary Committee has been formed, including about 120 members, pledged to give their attention to Indian affairs, and to see justice done. Then as regards the Press INDIA has been established as a first-class weekly journal, forming a storehouse of facts and arguments for journalists and speakers throughout the country, and keeping before the British public the Indian view of current events. Again, the platform has been utilised as far as means permitted, by Indian and British speakers, who have explained to sympathetic audiences the needs of India, and the means by which she may be made prosperous and contented. The results of this active campaign in Parliament and the country have been very gratifying; and we find that on the most important questions affecting India the Congress view has in each case prevailed, however vehemently it may have been at first assailed. Among the most striking recent instances are the forward policy beyond the North-West frontier, the plague regulations; the famine grant; and the financial relations of India to England. In each of these cases the initiative was taken by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and carried through with (in some instances) little or no support from other quarters. Through Parliament, in the Press, and on the platform, the Indian view was urged openly and persistently under circumstances of exceptional difficulty and discouragement. The result has been that, as regards the North-West frontier, the conservative policy of Lord Lawrence has been received back into favour; while as regards the plague regulations the compulsory segregation, to which special objection was taken, has been abandoned. It may perhaps be said that these changes in the Government policy have resulted from the force of circumstances, and not from the urgency of the Congress party. But this contention would only show that the Indian view has in each case

been supported by the force of circumstances, and that much loss and suffering would have been avoided if that view had been accepted at an earlier stage. Again, as regards the financial relations of India to the British Empire, a question of vital economic importance, the appointment of a Royal Commission was obtained by the exertions of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, led by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji; during the five years for which the Royal Commission lasted, the Indian view was laboriously kept to the front by the minority on the Commission which represented Congress views; the Indian view has now received public and official recognition in the Minority Report; to the extent of ¼ million sterling per annum the Commission has unanimously found the charges placed upon India to be unfair; and the Government has accepted this finding, thus conceding to India a first instalment of financial justice. As regards the demand for a famine grant from the Imperial Exchequer, it is true that this concession has not yet been accorded. But, looking to the support given to the claim, in the House of Commons, by public opinion, and by the leading British journals, we may hope that in this particular case also the view of the Congress party will ultimately prevail. Further, we referred above (para. 1) to certain dangerous fallacies which recent events have dispelled. Of these the most important are, the official belief in the prosperous condition of the rayat; and the distrust of Indian loyalty. These unfortunate misapprehensions have led to serious errors alike in legislation and in administrative acts. But in both of these matters the progress of events has brought about a change of opinion. The destitution of the rayat has been manifested by his inability to resist death by famine; while the loyalty of the Indian people has been demonstrated, beyond all cavil, by the ready and whole-hearted support given to the British Empire at the most critical point in the affairs of South Africa and China.

12. In glancing at these questions of high imperial importance, we have no wish unduly to magnify the work of the British Committee, or to reflect on those who have honestly differed from us. But we think it is only justice to the Indian people to show how markedly, in these troublous times, their counsels and action have tended to the safety, honour and welfare of her Majesty and her dominions.

13. Reverting to the point from which we started, we desire again to express our hope that the forecast of Lord G. Hamilton will come true; that good may come out of evil; and that after sufferings, bravely met by joint effort, a fresh bond of union may be formed between the rulers and the ruled. The British are a practical people, and have now had an opportunity of realising, from hard facts, the disadvantage of disregarding Indian opinion. There will always exist a difference between official and non-official opinion, a difference which arises from looking at the same matters from two different points of view: the old story of the shield, silver on one side and gold on the other. But of all people in the world the Indians are naturally the most docile and submissive to authority; and all they ask for is a fair hearing in order to promote the common good. Why then go on with this damaging conflict in Parliament, in the Press, and before the British public? A *Concordat* would be much better for all parties, and the olive branch how held out by the highest authority will, we believe, be gladly welcomed by the influential and educated classes throughout India. The opportunity seems in every way a good one under the present Viceroy, who by his energy, independence, and sympathy, has won golden opinions from all. India is now lying prostrate from accumulated misfortunes. What is wanted is to bring all available forces together, in order to raise her up, and lead her again into paths of prosperity. The first step in this direction is to ascertain by searching enquiry the causes of her downfall, and to devise remedies suited to her varied and peculiar economic conditions. To initiate and direct this all-important work we believe that Lord Curzon is pre-eminently fitted, and that if he will undertake it, a new and happier era may arise for India. Should these views meet with the approval of the Congress which is to assemble at Lahore next Christmas, we would suggest that the question of the economic condition of India should take the foremost place in its deliberations, and that a resolution should be passed earnestly praying Lord Curzon to institute a full and independent enquiry. If such a resolution were sent to the Viceroy in Council with a carefully-prepared and temperate statement, showing facts and proposed remedies, it would not, we believe, fail to receive the careful consideration of the Government. Looking to the varied conditions in different parts of India, and to the fact that the village is the economic unit, it appears to us that the best form for the enquiry would be a detailed village enquiry, conducted in selected typical villages in the different provinces which have suffered from famine. If means can be discovered to make these typical villages safe and prosperous, a clue will have been found to make safe and prosperous the many villages of which rural India consists.

14. As regards the work in England we have pointed out the striking success which has attended the labours of the British Committee. But the work in England is great and difficult, and the workers are few; and these are overtaxed both as to physical endurance and financial resources. That is why one of us who now address you (Sir W. Wedderburn) has been driven to retire from Parliament. For seven years he has had a double burden—direct work for India; together with the wear and tear of contested elections, care for the special interests of his constituents, and the multifarious duties of Parliamentary life. He has found it not possible to continue this double burden, and has therefore, with great reluctance, for the present retired from the House of Commons, in order to economise his resources for the direct work on behalf of India. This explanation seems necessary because it has been widely believed that he was retiring from public life, and was abandoning the advocacy of India's cause. This is not at all the case. He does not desire to lay down the Indian burden. He only asks friends in India so to lighten it that it may not be beyond his strength. If the personal and financial strain is removed he may again seek to obtain a seat in the House of Commons, as it is there alone that the great questions on which the fate of India depends are ultimately decided.

15. In conclusion we repeat that the present time is a critical one. On the one hand, by hard earnest work, by showing knowledge, industry, good feeling, and a united purpose, the Congress may constitute itself a valued adviser to the Government of India, and an influence in England tending to strengthen the Empire. On the other hand if the necessary sacrifice and self-denial are not exercised, if from want of courage and constancy the Indian people allow this constitutional effort to lapse, the work of years will be thrown away, and a danger will arise that the physical sufferings of the masses may lead to counsels of despair. Against such a conclusion we, who have given our best years to the service of India, will to the last use our best efforts, in the interest alike of India and of this country.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) W. Wedderburn.
A. O. Hume.
Dadabhai Naoroji.

84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
October 19, 1900.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN ON FAMINE IN INDIA.

IMPORTANT MEETING AT TUNBRIDGE WELLS.

[Special Report.]

On Sunday last, November 4, Sir William Wedderburn delivered an address in the Great Hall, Tunbridge Wells, upon "The Indian Famine: its Causes and Remedy." The meeting was one of a series held during the autumn and winter under the title "Sunday Social Gatherings." Councillor F. Lawson Dodd (honorary secretary) presided, and there was an excellent attendance. Among those present were Captain Carpenter, Mr. Cyril Cox, Mr. Henry Robertson, Mr. Alfred Robertson, Mr. Barlow, Mrs. Le Lacheur, Mr. James Overnall, and Mrs. Abbott.

The Chairman having cordially welcomed Sir William Wedderburn on behalf of himself and the Committee,

Sir William Wedderburn said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I am very grateful to my friend Mr. Lawson Dodd for the opportunity he has given me to say a few words about Indian Famines, in order to indicate some of the causes of these recurring calamities and to suggest possible means of prevention. It is admitted on all hands that in the present famine the Government of India has worked well in the administration of relief; also large sums have been contributed by private charity; but it is evident that this does not go to the root of the matter. Famine relief and charity no doubt mitigate the existing calamity, but they do nothing towards investigating the causes in the past or discovering remedies for the future. Now there is a good proverb which says that prevention is better than cure; and if prevention is better than cure, it is much better than mere mitigation. Hence I find people continually asking me, "Are Indian famines inevitable? Can nothing be done by way of prevention?" I say that people are right to ask this question. If in our own locality we had an outbreak of typhoid fever, we should not consider it sufficient to give medicine to relieve the sufferers. We should demand a minute, a microscopic, enquiry into the causes of the outbreak, with a view to prevention in the future. So as regards India, for whose welfare we are responsible, it is our bounden duty to insist that a full and fearless enquiry should be made into the causes of all this death and suffering. Now, in answer to this important question—"Can nothing be done by way of prevention?"—I reply that much may be done; and, further, I maintain that on Government rests the responsibility of investigating the causes and discovering the remedies. Unfortunately this is not the official view. The other day Sir Henry Fowler, in the House of Commons, expressing the official view, declared that he did not see where the responsibility of Government came in with regard to the causes of the famine; and he said that the cause of famine was the failure of rain, and he did not see how Government could fairly be blamed for a bad monsoon. Now this may be true as far as it goes, but it is not the whole truth.

For famine—which means death by starvation—is made up of two factors: drought and destitution. Drought produces a loss of harvest, but that alone would not cause wholesale death by hunger if the villages possessed a domestic store of food, or money, or credit, sufficient to tide over one failure of harvest. It is because the people do not possess this domestic store that they die of hunger. Therefore it is evident that famine is not caused by drought alone, but by its effects upon a population which is in a chronic and dangerous state of destitution. Not only do the peasantry as a class possess nothing, but they possess much less than nothing, being hopelessly in debt to the money-lenders. And I further maintain that Government is directly responsible for such a condition of things, because this destitution has been produced by over-taxation and by the introduction of revolutionary changes unsuited to the condition of the people. It is all very well for Sir H. Fowler to say that Government is not responsible; but in India, where the people have no voice in their own affairs, the responsibility of Government is complete. The officials jealously keep all power in their own hands, and as they retain all the power, so they must accept all the responsibility. (Applause.)

The practical question, then, that we have to ask is, what are the causes of this chronic and dangerous destitution among the Indian peasantry? And in considering this point we must remember that there are very few large towns in India, and that eighty per cent. of the population is contained in the rural villages, where the land is cultivated by the rayats, or peasant proprietors, who pay rent to the Government on their holdings, which are usually from ten to fifty acres. The question is, Why are these men not in a position to tide over one failure of harvest? In order to make the situation clear I will state my view in the form of three propositions; and the first of these is, that this chronic destitution ought not to exist, there being in rural India all the elements of wealth. With a rich soil, a fine climate, and abundant labour, cheap and skilful, India ought to be a garden, not a place of desolation. I have said that labour is abundant, and here we come upon one of those popular fallacies which have done so much to obscure the real facts. It is constantly alleged that the cause of Indian poverty is the too rapid multiplication of the people and the consequent over-population. But as a matter of fact the Indian ratio of increase is not high as compared with other countries. Also this abundant population is a population of wealth producers, if they only get a fair chance. The position is like that of a factory with unlimited raw material, and unlimited demand for the manufactured article. In that case abundant labour is a source not of poverty, but of wealth. Again, I said that the labour was cheap, and here we come upon another favourite fallacy, which is that the poverty of the rayat arises from his extravagance in marriage and other ceremonies. This fallacy was dispelled by the report of the Deccan Riots Commission, who after long and detailed enquiry were of opinion that the rayat's expenditure in these ways was not more than reasonable. The fact is, the rayat is the most frugal of human beings, living on the average at a cost of 1½d. a day. As regards the great skill of the rayat as a cultivator, we have the evidence of Sir James Caird, one of the Famine Commissioners and the highest authority on such matters, who declared that there was nothing that we could teach him. And as a matter of fact the *petite culture* of India brings every market product to its greatest perfection, as we see in the case of opium, rice, indigo, tea, coffee and tobacco. Under these conditions, and with the protection of the *pax Britannica*, we should expect among the Indian peasantry not destitution, but a substantial share of material comfort. My second proposition is that there formerly existed a cheap and complete safeguard against famine in the ancient custom of domestic grain storage. When I first went out to India, forty years ago, I served in the Bombay Deccan, which is now one of the famine districts, and at that time the practice was general of storing grain in dry pits dug under the houses. The staple food there is millet, a small grain in a hard shell, which can be thus kept for a long time; and these domestic stores were often sufficient to feed the family, not only for one season, but for three or four years. This practice was recognised by the Famine Commissioners who reported that the "custom of storing grain, as a protection against failure of harvest, used to be general among the agricultural classes." And that it was an ancient practice in the East will be familiar to you from the story of Joseph in Egypt, who, during the fat years, laid up a store sufficient to feed the land during famine. You will also remember the parable of the rich man, who filled his barns in time of plenty, and thus had "much good laid up for many years." My third and last proposition is that this simple and effective safeguard against famine has been lost owing to the action of Government. Now when I say that the ruin of the rayat has been caused by revolutionary changes introduced by the Government, I do not mean to say that these changes were all bad. On the contrary, many of them were good in themselves, and they were almost all introduced with the best intentions. This was so as regards the domestic storage of grain. For this storage was easy and natural, because the surplus produce of each year was not marketable, there being few roads or other means of communication. When under our Government roads and railways were opened up, the surplus produce was drained out of the villages and went to distant markets. Again, if the rayat was in debt the creditor did not care to seize the store of grain because it had no saleable value; also local public opinion would not have permitted his doing so. Now we have erected courts of justice on the European model in the rural districts; the creditor with a decree of the court in his hand, has behind him the whole power of the British Empire; and he makes a clean sweep of the little hoard upon which the safety of the debtor and his family used to depend. Of course the official answer to this is that it is for the advantage of the rayat to find a market for his surplus produce, and that he thus stores up money instead of grain for the time of need. This answer might be a good one if the rayat were able to store up the money, but, unfortunately, so heavy is the Government rent and other taxation that he is drained of all cash and is besides forced into hopeless debt to the money-lender. In the old times rent was taken from him in kind, as part of the gross produce; so he paid according to a sliding scale—a large amount when the harvest was good, little when the harvest was scanty, and nothing if it failed. But by one of those revolutionary changes to which I have referred, we now exact a fixed and rigid cash payment; and as this is rigorously collected before the crop is harvested, the cultivator must go to the money-lender, and thus his trouble begins. Once in debt his ruin is assured, for the debt mounts up by usurious interest, and through the machinery of the civil courts he becomes the hopeless slave of the money-lender. He thus lives from hand to mouth; and one failure of harvest makes him the ready victim of famine. (Applause.)

Now, it will be asked, what is the remedy? I think long ago someone used to sell pills for earthquakes. I propose no quack remedy; no single pill that will cure all ills from which the rayat is suffering. But I have indicated some of the causes which have led to his ruin, and those causes must be scientifically dealt with. We must in the first place reconstitute the rayat's domestic store, either of food, of money, or of credit; and in order to do this we must rescue him from the clutches of the money-lender. One means of doing this is by the establishment of agricultural banks, such as exist in every civilised country where there is a peasant proprietary. (There are 2,000 such banks in Germany alone.) Also the taxation must be reduced, and collected in a less rigid manner. A modified form of collection in kind might be adopted; while courts of arbitration should be established for the rural districts. But all such reforms depend upon economy in administration, the reduction of military expenditure, and the fair apportionment between India and this country of the cost of wars carried on in the general interests of the Empire. I have indicated some of the directions in which remedies may be sought; but all that I now ask for is a careful and fearless enquiry in a few typical selected villages in the different famine districts, in order to test the truth of my allegations. The village is the unit and microcosm of all India; and if by careful enquiry and practical experiment we can find the way to make one village prosperous, we have found the clue to make prosperous the half million villages of which rural India is made up. (Applause.)

The following resolution was proposed by Mr. A. J. Robertson:—

"That this meeting is of opinion that a careful and minute enquiry should be made into the economic condition of the Indian cultivator, with a view to ascertain the causes which render him so helpless to resist the attacks of famine and pestilence, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State for India."

Mr. G. A. Robertson seconded, and the resolution was carried unanimously.

A hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer was then accorded.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

RAIN MUCH WANTED.

1,077,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

Rain is much wanted in parts of Bombay Presidency, Baroda, and Nizam's dominions, winter crops' sowings being impeded. Otherwise prospects generally good. Prices falling slowly and famine conditions disappearing. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 407,000; Central Provinces, 441,000; Berar, 111,000; Ajmere-Merwara, relief discontinued; Rajputana Native States, 8,000; Central India Native States, 12,000; Bombay Native States, 33,000; Baroda, 26,000; Punjab Native States, 3,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 11,000; Haidarabad, 25,000.—Total, 1,077,000.

The Secretary of State for India has also received the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Following are figures for week ended October 27:—Famine-stricken districts—106 cases of cholera, of which 60 were fatal. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief, 909, or 2 1-5 per mille. No rain except light showers in four districts. Rain is much needed in all districts. Numbers relieved are diminishing.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the sufferers from the Indian Famine amounted on Monday night to £384,400.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (November 3) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisements in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

List of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	£860	5	1
Manchester Banker (extra)		5	0
Total to date	£865	5	1

Open Letters to Lord Curzon
ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: Kegan Paul & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended employment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News*

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed, well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the enquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle.*

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and tha the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes good his claim to the attention of the governing authorities."—*The World.*

"His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Literature.*

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London. In India to B. C. Ghose, Esq., M.A., Lecturer, City College, Calcutta, who will furnish further particulars.

NEW VOLUME OF HUNTER'S INDIA.
Just Published. Vol. II. 8vo. 16s.

A HISTORY OF BRITISH INDIA.

BY

Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER,
K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D.,
A Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LONDON.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. Venor says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. ber bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras

"INDIA," 1901.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London office. To this rule there will be no exception.

In order to obtain every number published during 1901 it is necessary that the name of the Subscriber and his Subscription should be received in London before December 31, 1900, as back numbers will not be stocked. New names will be added as received, but no back numbers can be obtained.

Subscribers are requested to cut out the Order Form printed below, and forward it to the London office, together with a Post Office Money Order for the sterling equivalent of Six Rupees (net), made payable to W. Douglas Hall, Manager of "INDIA."

ORDER FORM.

To the Manager of "INDIA,"
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

Please send "INDIA" during 1901,

To be written clearly.

Name ______________________

Address ______________________

____

for which is enclosed the sum of Six Rupees.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.